

### **REMARKS**

In accordance to the foregoing, claims 1, 7, 14, 20, 27, and 32 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 1-36 are pending and under consideration.

### **NON-COMPLIANT NOTICE**

In the claim listing, the status of claims 14, 20, and 32, was corrected to indicate "currently amended."

### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication that claims 10 and 23 contain allowable subject matter. However, since Applicant considers that claims 7 and 20, from which claims 10 and 23 respectively depend, define patentable subject matter, claims 10 and 23 are maintained in dependent form at the present time.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 36 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-9, 11-22 and 24-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,615,240 to Sullivan et al. (hereinafter "Sullivan") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,449,601 to Friedland et al. ("Friedland").

In the response filed on July 10, 2006<sup>1</sup>, Applicant argued that Friedland does not disclose at least "displaying a point value sequentially changing independently from one or more other client machines" because:

1. None of the indicated paragraphs of Friedland refer to **displaying** a changing value;
2. The claimed **point value** does not correspond to either price point or lots;
3. Stating a problem is not the same as teaching a solution.

In response to Applicant's arguments, in the outstanding Office Action it is asserted that Applicants arguments that the point value as used in the claims of the present application are moot because the arguments are not directly related to the language of the claims. In his Response to Arguments section, the Examiner suggests that the claims to be amended to recite clearer the patentable features more clearly.

Applicant amends independent claims 1, 7, 14, 20, 27 and 32 herewith for clarification purpose, respectfully submitting that the amendments reformulate features that Applicant considered already recited in the claims.

Claim 1 is amended to recite “a point value display section for displaying a point value sequentially changing independently from one or more other client machines when said tentative service utilization section is utilizing a tentative service, the point value becoming a time available in the regular service if the client machine registers to the regular service.” Applicant respectfully submits that Friedland and Sullivan do not teach or suggest the above reproduced feature at least because the point value as recited in amended claim 1 does not correspond to either price points or lots from Friedman. Additionally, neither Friedland nor Sullivan discloses displaying a changing value (i.e., the point value).

Claims 2-6 depending upon claim 1 are also patentable at least by inheriting patentable features from independent claim 1.

Claim 7 is amended to recite “said regular service providing section is adapted to provide a service independently from one or more other client machines corresponding to a point value acquired during the tentative service provided by said tentative service providing section until the client machine was accepted by said regular service utilization procedure accepting section.” Applicant respectfully submits that Friedland and Sullivan do not teach or suggest the above-reproduced feature of claim 7.

Claims 8-13 depending upon claim 7 are also patentable at least by inheriting patentable features from independent claim 7.

Claim 14 is amended to recite “a point value display section for displaying a point value sequentially changing independently from one or more other client machines when said tentative service utilization section is utilizing the tentative service, the point value becoming a time available in a regular service when the computer registers for the regular service.” Applicant respectfully submits that Friedland and Sullivan do not teach or suggest the above-reproduced feature of claim 14.

Claims 15-19 depending upon claim 14 are also patentable at least by inheriting patentable features from independent claim 14.

Claim 20 is amended to recite “said regular service providing section provides the service independently from one or more other client machines according to a point value acquired during the tentative service provided by said tentative service providing section until said client machine was accepted by said regular service utilization accepting section.” Applicant respectfully submits that Friedland and Sullivan do not teach or suggest the above-reproduced feature of claim 20.

Claims 21-26 depending upon claim 20 are also patentable at least by inheriting

---

<sup>1</sup> See the Response filed on July 10, 2006, pages 12-13.

patentable features from independent claim 20.

Claim 27 is amended to recite "providing the regular service to the user machine whose regular service utilization procedure was accepted and also providing the regular service free corresponding to said calculated point value to the user whose utilization procedure was accepted." Applicant respectfully submits that Friedland and Sullivan do not teach or suggest the above-reproduced feature of claim 27.

Claims 28-31 depending upon claim 27 are also patentable at least by inheriting patentable features from independent claim 27.

Claim 32 is amended to recite "a regular service providing section for providing the regular service to the at least one client machine said procedure of which was accepted, said regular service providing section being adapted to provide free regular service corresponding to a point value acquired during the tentative service provided by said tentative service providing section for a time lapse up to a moment when the procedure made by the at least one client machine was accepted by said regular service utilization procedure accepting section." Applicant respectfully submits that Friedland and Sullivan do not teach or suggest the above-reproduced feature of claim 32.

Claims 32-36 depending upon claim 32 are also patentable at least by inheriting patentable features from independent claim 32.

## CONCLUSION

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Jan 25, 2007

By: LTodor  
Luminita A. Todor  
Registration No. 57,639

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501